BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 08630 060 3

№ 7572.226

GIVEN BY

James M. Barnard.

1905
K JAN 21
O SEP 7
O MAR 25
1909
DEC 24
1910
K OCT 4

Charles Sumner's More Excellent Way.

7572.226

By EDWIN D. MEAD.

Reprinted from the Editor's Table of the
New England Magazine,
October, 1893.

PUBLIC LIBRARY
OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON

James M. Barnard,
Oct. 2, 1899

7572.226

CHARLES SUMNER'S MORE EXCELLENT WAY.

BY EDWIN D. MEAD.

Reprinted from the Editor's Table of the New England Magazine, October, 1898.

CHARLES Sumner began his public life by what he himself called a *declaration of war against war*. His great oration on "The True Grandeur of Nations" marked, his biographer rightly observes, the most important epoch in Sumner's life. "Had he died before this event, his memory would have been only a tradition with the few early friends who survive him. The Fourth of July, 1845, gave him a national and more than a national fame." Epoch-making in Sumner's own life, we think it may be safely said that no oration which he ever gave has greater intrinsic importance and that no other will be read so long. Of all pleas made by American men for the rule of peace on earth, it is by far the noblest and the most comprehensive. There is almost no argument against war which it does not somehow make use of; and the advocate of peace in all the years returns to it and returns again for support and inspiration.

There was nothing upon which Sumner dwelt with greater emphasis in this famous oration than upon the cost and waste of war and the incalculable advantage that would result from the diversion of these misapplied resources to purposes of education and the real development and progress of society. Passing from the fearful cost of war itself, he discussed the regular, permanent expense of the war footing, the preparations for war in time of peace. His survey of the armies and navies and fortifications of Europe is interesting to-day chiefly as revealing how startlingly the burden has increased in the fifty years between then and now. In the United States, he found that the average annual appropriation for military and naval purposes was eighty per cent of the total annual expenses of the government. "Yes,

eighty cents in every dollar were applied in this unproductive manner. The remaining twenty cents sufficed to maintain the government in all its branches, executive, legislative and judicial,—the administration of justice, our relations with foreign nations, the post-office, and all the lighthouses which, in happy, useful contrast with the forts, shed their cheerful signals over the rough waves, beating upon our long coast." In the years from the formation of our government, in 1789, down to the time when Sumner spoke, almost twelve times as much was sunk under the sanction of the national government in mere peaceful preparations for war as was dedicated by the government during the same period to all other purposes whatever. Of the military expenses of the United States from that time to this, all of us know something.

But "the passage which was most striking at the time," says Sumner's biographer, "according to the testimony of hearers still living, was the one where, treating of the immense waste of war defences, he compared the cost of the 'Ohio,' a ship-of-the-line lying in the harbor and, on account of its decorations, a marked spectacle of the day, with that of Harvard College."

"Within cannon range of this city," he said, "stands an institution of learning which was one of the earliest cares of our forefathers, the conscientious Puritans. Favored child in an age of trial and struggle, carefully nursed through a period of hardship and anxiety, endowed at that time by the oblations of men like Harvard, sustained from its first foundation by the parental arm of the commonwealth, by a constant succession of munificent bequests, and by the prayers of good men, the University at Cambridge now invites our homage, as the most ancient, most interesting and most important seat of learning in the land."

He spoke of its library, the oldest and most valuable in the country, its museums, its schools of law, divinity and medicine, its body of professors and teachers, "many of whose names help to keep the name of the country respectable in every part of the globe where science, learning and taste are cherished, and its distinguished president, Josiah Quincy, who had rendered such high public service in so many fields. "Such," he said, "is Harvard University; and as one of the humblest of her children, happy in the memories of a youth nurtured in her classic retreats, I cannot allude to her without an expression of filial affection and respect. It appears," he added, "from the last report of the treasurer, that the whole available property of the University, the various accumulations of more than two centuries of generosity, amounts"— 1845 was still the day of small things at Harvard — "to $703,175."

"Change the scene," said Sumner, "and cast your eyes upon another object. There now swings idly at her moorings in this harbor a ship of the line, the 'Ohio,' carrying ninety guns, finished as late as 1836 at an expense of $547,888, repaired only two years afterwards for $233,012, with an armament which has cost $53,945, making an aggregate of $834,845."—1845 was still the day of small things in battle-ships — "as the actual outlay at this moment for that single ship, more than $100,000 beyond all the available wealth of the richest and most ancient seat of learning in the land!"

He referred to the "Ohio" because that ship happened to be in the harbor, not because it afforded the strongest case. The expense of the "Delaware," in 1842, had reached $1,051,000. He pursued the comparison further. The expenditures of the University during the preceding year had been $47,935. The cost of the "Ohio" for one year of service was $220,000. "For the annual sum lavished on a single ship of the line, four institutions like Harvard University might be supported." The pay of the captain of a ship like the "Ohio" was $4,500; the salary of the president of Harvard University was $2,235.

"If the large endowments of Harvard University," he continued, "are dwarfed by comparison with a single ship of the line, how must it be with other institutions of learning and beneficence, less favored by the bounty of many generations? The av-

erage cost of a sloop of war is $315,000, — more, probably, than all the endowments of those twin stars of learning in the western part of Massachusetts, the colleges at Williamstown and Amherst, and of that single star in the east, the seminary at Andover. The yearly expense of a sloop of war in service is about $50,000, — more than the annual expenditures of these three institutions combined."

"Take all the institutions of learning and beneficence," — so Sumner concluded his arraignment,— "the crown jewels of the Commonwealth, schools, colleges, hospitals, asylums; and the sums by which they have been purchased and preserved are trivial and beggarly compared with the treasures squandered within the borders of Massachusetts in vain preparations for war, — upon the navy yard at Charlestown, with its stores on hand, costing $4,741,000, the fortifications in the harbors of Massachusetts, where untold sums are already sunk, and it is now proposed to sink $3,875,000 more, and the arsenal at Springfield, containing, in 1842, 175,118 muskets, valued at $2,099,998, and maintained by an annual appropriation of $200,000, — whose highest value will ever be, in the judgment of all lovers of truth, that it inspired a poem which in influence will be mightier than a battle, and will endure when arsenals and fortifications have crumbled to earth.

" 'Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals or forts.' "

*
* *

At the Alumni dinner at Harvard in Commencement week, last June, the attention of Harvard and of the country was recalled to these old utterances of Sumner's in an emphatic and surprising way. Charles Francis Adams, the president of the Alumni, who spoke chiefly of the Civil War, observed, in introducing President Eliot, after critical words upon the character and tendencies of the war with Spain, that the cost of the war, estimated at $40,000,000 per month, would run three hundred and sixty-five universities of the size of Harvard. Taking up this word in opening his speech, President Eliot said:

"I am not sure I shall be able to follow President Adams in the line he has suggested. The quick capital of Harvard University is not more than the cost of two battle-ships; but can we compute what those battle-ships may win? It was Charles Sumner, who looks down upon us from the other side of this hall, who first made comparisons of that nature; and some years after he had made them, there came upon us the terrific struggle which President Adams has been describing so eloquently. About that time I came to the conclusion that the whole argument of Charles Sumner was a fallacious one."

President Eliot said other things concerning war and patriotism, in his speech, upon which, were this a more general word upon those subjects, we should have something to say. He spoke with manifest approval and with warmth of those students who upon any call to arms "offered their lives and their labor to their country without much thought except for love— just as a lover throws a rose at the feet of his mistress." "The educated youth," he said, "who loves his country, does not stop to consider in what precise cause his country has gone to war." We should have something to say concerning these utterances because, while all who are familiar with President Eliot's position upon public matters must know well how he himself, speaking more leisurely and deliberately, would supplement and qualify them, we consider their primary and natural significance and influence so vicious — to use the word which, instead of fallacious, the newspapers attributed to President Eliot in his characterization of Sumner's argument. Their influence seems to us especially dangerous in a time like that through which we have been passing. They do not describe what seems to us the desirable or right state of mind for "the educated youth." It may become the solemn duty of the educated youth, as of each common citizen, to serve his country, even on the battlefield, in a cause to which he does not believe his country has been wisely or rightly committed, — because far more may depend upon his country's

integrity and welfare than upon anything balanced in a special policy. But if the educated youth in our universities do not "stop to consider," if they do not ask questions, if they are not trained to discriminate between causes, the causes in which their country goes to war, determining soberly and rationally what cause they can support zealously, what reluctantly, and what not at all, — if such be the case with our educated youth, what will be the case with the unlearned and the untrained, and what must be the fate of the republic?

*
* *

No one surely knows better than President Eliot himself the difference between causes and between the services which the educated youth may be asked to render his government. Of the Civil War and the war with Spain he declared distinctly, in this same speech: "The two wars, in their origin and motive, can hardly be compared;" and no one would ever suspect him of any general spirit of jingoism or militarism. Two newspapers lying on our table as we write quote trenchant words from him of the sort necessary for these times. The first passage is from the close of a recent address:

"After everything possible has been said in favor of martial virtues and achievements, whenever our people really take up the question how best to win glory, honor and love for free institutions in general and the American Republic in particular, whether in our own eyes or in the eyes of other nations and later times, they will come to the conclusion that more glory, honor and love are to be won by national justice, sincerity, patience in failure and generosity in success than by national impatience, combativeness and successful self-seeking, by as much as the virtues and ideals of civilized man excel those of barbarous man."

The second passage is from his address at the Washington Conference in 1896 in the interest of a permanent arbitration treaty with England. In that address he spoke of the recent jingoism in this country as "a detestable thing," "an offensive foreign importation," "a delusion than which a more complete cannot be imagined."

"What other powerful nation," he asked, "has dispensed with a standing army? What other nation with an immense seaboard has maintained but an insignificant fleet? It has been our glory to be safe, though without fortresses, fleets or armies." "I, too," he exclaimed, "believe that this nation has a mission in the world, a noble mission; but it is not that of armed force. It is not by force of arms that we may best commend to the peoples of the earth the blessings of liberty and self-government; but rather by taking millions from various peoples into our own land, and here giving them experience of the advantages of freedom. . . . There is only one other means by which we should teach these principles to men. It is by example —by giving a persuasive example of happiness and prosperity, arrived at through living in freedom and at peace. Never should we advocate the extension of our institutions by force of arms, either on sea or land."

We believe, says the writer who recalls this Washington address of President Eliot's, that Sumner would have called it a consummate practical statement of his argument, and would have recognized his own voice in the noble passage quoted. "We appeal from President Eliot, the Alumni dinner orator in time of the excitement and delirium of war, to President Eliot in time of peace and sobriety."

*
* *

With President Eliot, therefore, we should be slow to believe that we have any long or fundamental controversy. But with his word at Harvard in June, with any reflection upon Sumner's argument in "The True Grandeur of Nations," we do have controversy. We can think of nothing more dangerous or deplorable, especially at this time in America, than encouragement to our educated youth to view that great argument

and vision as vicious or fallacious. We believe that in the line of Sumner's thought lies the hope of the world; and we believe that those who think as Sumner thought, should, without recourse to any generalities, to anything remote in time or place, apply that principle firmly and sweepingly to the situation through which the republic has been passing and the situation which confronts us to-day.

We have spent $300,000,000 in a war with Spain. We are in the outer circles of the maelstrom of a policy which means larger armies, larger navies, costlier forts and more of them, and all the paraphernalia of the old world militarism which we have prided ourselves on being free from,— with the corresponding burdens of taxation, the devotion to waste and destruction of the immense resources which might otherwise go to development and progress. The man who does not see that we are in the outer circles of this maelstrom is a fool; and the man who, seeing it, has no forebodings is not a student of history. Is this way of spending money, which is now proposed to the republic, — to put Sumner's question directly to ourselves, — a wise way? Is it protective, is it constructive, is it good business, is it common sense, does it pave a good road into the future, is it the economical and promising way to secure the results we claim to aim at, will it make us a truer and safer democracy, and will it help the world? Was Sumner right, was Longfellow right, or was he not, in claiming that if half the wealth bestowed on camps, given to maintain armies and navies, were given to redeem the human mind, to educate the human race, there would soon be no need of armies and navies?

We have spent $300,000,000 in a war with Spain. Have we spent it well? Have we done the most that could be done with $300,000,000 to accomplish what we claimed to want to accomplish? Our object in going to war with Spain was to make Cuba free, to make it a better place to live in, to ensure it better government, and make its people comfortable and happy. Have we done it? Have we got our money's worth? Has our way of spending our $300,000,000 been best — or would Sumner's way have been best? If in the midst of last April's perplexities the senator who sits in Sumner's seat had addressed words like the following to the senate and the nation, would they have been vicious or fallacious words?

We are clearly drifting towards a war with Spain in behalf of Cuba. In a month, unless we show wisdom greater than the past has shown, we shall be in the midst of war. That war will cost us $300,000,000. Is there not a better way of spending $300,000,000? Is there not a better way of achieving what we aim at — the freedom, good government and development of Cuba? I propose that we submit to Cuba and to Spain this offer and request: Let us establish at Havana a university as well equipped as Harvard University, with an endowment of $10,000,000, free to every young man and woman of Cuba, with the best professors who can be secured from America and Spain and England and France and Germany. Let us establish at Santiago and Matanzas and Puerto Principe colleges like Amherst and Williams, with a total endowment of $10,000,000; and in each of the twenty largest towns a high school or academy, at a cost of $10,000,000. Let us devote $20,000,000 — $1,000,000 a year for twenty years — to the thorough planting in Cuba of our American common school system; $10,000,000 to the promotion of a system of free public libraries, making books as accessible and common in each Cuban town and village as in Barnstable or Berkshire; and $6,000,000 for the maintenance in each of the six provinces of a newspaper conducted by the best men who can be enlisted in the service, bringing all Cuban men and women into touch with all the world, giving them those things which will feed them, and not giving them those things which would poison them. Let us build a Cuban Central Railroad through the whole length of the island, from Mantua to Maysi; and let us devote the balance of $100,000,000 to the scientific organization, by proper bureaus, of Cuban agriculture, industry, and commerce. Let there be a truce for ten years, till these things are done and begin to show their fruits; and then let the representatives of the United States and Spain meet at Havana to settle the "Cuban question" as it then exists. This, fellow citizens of America,

seems to me worth trying. If it succeeds, we should at least have saved $200,000,000; and it would be, I think, a kind of success more pregnant with good for Cuba and Spain and America and humanity than the success which we may be celebrating next September. I spent the still hours of last night, leaving all this hurly-burly, reading Charles Sumner's solemn words on "The True Grandeur of Nations;" and his message has commanded me to submit this proposition to you at this hour. There are those of you who will laugh and scoff and say the thought is all chimerical, vicious and fallacious; but I say unto you, in the name of the God of our fathers, that with those of you who do not think so lies the hope of the world. I say that the kingdom of God can come in this world, that peace and justice and fraternity can come among men, that democracy itself has a safe future, only as some elect people, with sublime abandon, in a great opportunity, does this thing, — taking, in this world of undeniable and conflicting risks, the heroic risk, the risk which alone has in it hope for the world and relish of salvation. And our opportunity is now.

*
* *

We wish that these considerations might sink deeply into the heart of every member of Harvard University and into the hearts of all the educated youth of America. If our republic is to be true to itself, if we are to help civilization forward and not backward, then the young men of our universities and all of us who look at war and national defence and national grandeur in the old way have got to be born again, — nothing less than that, — baptized with the spirit wherewith Charles Sumner was baptized, and have our eyes opened to see that his way is the only right or sensible or efficient way, and that now we are wasting our substance and defeating ourselves. The revolution in the point of view is as radical as the difference between Ptolemy and Copernicus; but when we go through it, things fall at once into order, we find ourselves in a rational world with right means for right ends, and our old notions of what is wise and prudent and necessary for the defence and upbuilding and influence of the nation instantly dissolve, stamped all as vicious and fallacious. Our thoughts on what it is that makes a nation strong need, almost all of them, to be turned inside out. Our economies and generosities are all Ptolemaic. We boast of public and private munificences in education and philanthropy. We need to understand that we are yet in the kindergarten of munificence as concerns all positive, constructive and real things. It would sometimes seem as if, were the devil privileged to organize the world so as to thwart struggling men most effectually, wasting their accumulations and cutting forever the margin of civilization, he would choose precisely what he now sees, the dominance of false political ideals and of gross unintelligence as to how men and nations should spend their money. If an eleventh commandment were to be added to the decalogue, it should be one addressed to nations, and should be: Thou shalt not waste thy substance. Last spring, as the war with Spain began, — a war whose aim and motive we justified and praised, although we held with the President and the Secretary of State and the Minister to Spain that it was wholly unnecessary for the attainment of its aim, — we wrote in these pages the following words; as the war ends, we repeat them, as another statement for this time of Sumner's argument, the economic argument, which our educated youth and all of us who wish to see the world get on need to ponder upon in a far severer and more serious way than most of us are wont to do:

Every war gives new life to that old notion which died so hard, but which is responsible for so much mischief in the world, that patriotism is somehow bound up with war—the patriotic man, the man who fights or wants to fight for his country. Congress "in a great wave of patriotism," we read, appropriates fifty million dollars for gunboats and torpedoes. No "wave of patriotism" is reported when Massachusetts appropriates a million dollars for good roads, when New York appropriates five millions for new schoolhouses, or Chicago ten millions for an ex-

position, when Boston builds a library, when the Adirondack forests are secured, when the college is endowed, and when good wages are paid in the factory. There may be exigencies when the appropriation of fifty millions dollars or five hundred millions for national defence or for national offence is the duty imposed upon the patriot; but the man who votes for guns and gunboats with a glow and an excitement which he does not feel when he has opportunity to help on the great interests of education, science, art and industry may be very sure that his glow is not the honest glow of patriotism, but is very likely the excitement of the tiger and the savage, which still lives on in good society and dies so hard in half-civilized and even civilized men. It happens every day that a council, a legislature or a congress will buoyantly, without computation, without protest and without debate, vote the people's thousands or millions of money for some great waste, some great destruction, new cruisers and new forts, when some poor pittance is grudgingly doled out, or grudgingly denied, each dollar pinched and challenged, for the measure of philanthropy, of conservation, of construction, of education, of relief, of encouragement or high emprise, whose generous and bold advancement would do so much to hasten the day when forts and cruisers shall be unnecessary and obsolete. Society is zealous and lavish on its displays and its defences, its dams and sewers and police and armament, and blind and niggardly a thousand times as to the things which affect its fountains and its real vitality, the interests of the discipline and the construction which make protection needless.

*
* *

The lifelong position of Charles Sumner upon the subject of armies and navies and forts and wars is to be commended to the educated youth of America at this time as a position peculiarly worthy of their adoption, imperatively worthy of their earnest thought. Sumner was not a non-resistant, not a man of "peace at any price." We know how warmly and efficiently, in his place in the Senate, he supported the government in the Civil War; and we know how otherwise he appealed to force when that appeal was necessary and just; we know how he believed in strong government and hated imbecile police—how he spoke of "the sword of the magistrate" in the very record of his services for peace. But the great principles of his "True Grandeur of Nations" were the principles of his whole life, from a time long before that oration to the last hour, when he bequeathed a thousand dollars to Harvard University for an annual prize for the best essay on Universal Peace. We do not remember any autobiographical passage in his writings so impressive as that in which, replying to unfriendly criticism, he gives an account of his devotion to the peace movement. We do not remember any passage anywhere which we would commend so earnestly at this time to the students of Harvard University as one worth striving to be able to parallel in their own autobiographies.

"My name," he wrote, "is connected somewhat with two questions, which may be described succinctly as those of peace and slavery. That which earliest enlisted me, and which has always occupied much of my thoughts, is the peace question. When scarcely nine years old, it was my fortune to listen to President Quincy's address before the Peace Society, delivered in the Old South Church. It made a deep and lasting impression on my mind; and though, as a boy and youth, I surrendered myself to the illusions of battles and wars, still as I came to maturity I felt too keenly their wickedness and woe. A lecture which I heard from William Ladd, in the old court house at Cambridge, shortly after I left college, confirmed these impressions." He tells how he expressed his ripened convictions to his friends, and how, going to Europe, he often dwelt upon them there. In Paris, when M. Victor Foucher submitted for his criticism the manuscript of his treatise upon the law of nations, Sumner, observing that he had adopted, among his fundamental principles, that war was recognized as the necessary arbitrament between nations, ventured to discuss this dogma; and while admitting that it was accepted by every publicist up to that time, suggested to him to be the first to brand it as unchristian and barbarous and to declare that the institution of war, defined and sanctioned by the law of nations as a mode of determining justice between them, was but another form of the ordeal by battle which was once regarded as a proper mode of determining justice between individuals. Returning to Boston after his two

years and a half in Europe, he tells of the little meeting of the American Peace Society to which he found his way in the very month of his arrival. "The Rev. Henry Ware was in the chair. I think there were not more than twelve persons present. We met in a small room under the Marlboro Chapel. On motion of Doctor Gannett, I was placed on the executive committee." He tells of his humble efforts for the cause in the next few years; and then he comes to the oration on the 4th of July, 1845. "The position taken by me on this occasion has drawn upon me not a little criticism — perhaps I might use a stronger expression. Convinced of its intrinsic propriety and importance, I have been drawn, on subsequent occasions, by an inevitable necessity, to sustain and fortify it. I hope that I shall always be willing to maintain it."

Universal peace, the methods by which war may be permanently superseded, — these were ever the burden of his thought and study, of addresses to the public and letters to friends; and ever the economic argument is at the front. "I wish our country would cease to whet its tusks," he writes to Doctor Howe in 1843. "The appropriations of the navy last year were nine million dollars. Imagine half — nay, a tithe — of this sum given annually to objects of humanity, education and literature! I know of nothing in our government that troubles me more than this thought." To his brother George in 1844: "I would not vote a dollar for any engine of war. One war-steamer costs more than all the endowments of Harvard College. Nations keep standing armies and Paixhan guns — sharpen their tusks — that they may be prepared for war. Far better to be always prepared for peace." Again: "What a boon to France, if her half million of soldiery were devoted to the building of railways and other internal improvements, instead of passing the day in carrying superfluous muskets! What a boon to Paris, if the immense sums absorbed in her fortifications were devoted to institutions of benevolence! She has more to fear from the poverty and wretchedness of her people than from any foreign foe." No crime was to him so great as that of the country which "entered into war for the sordid purpose of securing a few more acres of land." No letter that came to him among the many drawn out by "The True Grandeur of Nations" was more welcome than that from Theodore Parker, — his first letter to Sumner, the beginning of their friendship, — defending him from the attacks of "men of low morals, who can only swear by their party and live only in public opinion," and exclaiming: "The Church and State are both ready to engage in war, however unjust, if a little territory can be added to the national domain thereby. The great maxims of Christianity — the very words of Christ — are almost wholly forgotten." Full of faith in the republic, confident in the influence its institutions were destined to exert over the ancient establishments of Europe, he prayed "that a race of men may be reared among us competent to understand the destinies of the country, to abjure war, and to give extension and influence to our institutions by cultivating the arts of peace, by honesty, and by dignity of life and character." In the cause of peace lay to him the hope of the world. "It is destined," he said, "to a triumph much earlier than many imagine. It is so necessary to meet the financial embarrassments of Europe and the humane aspirations of the age, that it must succeed. Let it be presented carefully and clearly, let the incalculable good it has in store be unfolded, and people must feel its practicability. . . I have full faith in a coming era of humanity; but I believe it is to be brought about by removing existing evils, by education, and especially by removing the great evil and expense of war preparations, or the war system. If the friends of progress in Europe would aim at the armies and navies, direct all their energies at these monster evils, all else that can reasonably be desired will soon follow. Why not sound the idea in the ears of Europe?" It was to his brother, then in Europe, that he

wrote, in 1849. His call has been heard, fifty years afterwards, by the Czar of Russia.

In 1849, four years after the oration on "The True Grandeur of Nations," he delivered an address on "The Abolition of the War System in the Commonwealth of Nations," advocating instead of the arbitrament of arms a Congress of Nations, with a high court of judicature or arbitration; and the next year, as chairman of the Peace Congress for this country, he prepared an address to the people of the United States, recommending these methods. In 1870 he was still enforcing the truths which he enforced in 1845. He gave in many places, in the autumn of that year, a lecture on the war between France and Prussia, pointing as its moral that the war system should be discarded and the nations should disarm themselves. In 1873 he was invited to be one of the speakers at the public meeting held at Steinway Hall, New York, to stimulate a war spirit against Spain, at the time of the seizure of the "Virginius"—a meeting at which Mr. Evarts presided and made an inflammatory speech; but he declined, and instead sent a letter of a spirit directly opposite to that of the meeting, in which he insisted on waiting for evidence and on considerate treatment of the Spanish republic, and discountenanced the belligerent preparations then under way in our navy yards, which involved burdensome expenditure and encouraged an unhealthy war fever. In 1873 also, in the last summer of his life, he sent a letter of congratulation to Henry Richards, who had succeeded in carrying through the House of Commons a motion in favor of international arbitration. "It marks an epoch in a great cause. There is no question so supremely practical,—for it concerns not merely one nation, but every nation; and even its discussion promises to diminish the terrible chances of war. Its triumph would be the greatest reform of history." At the same time he wrote to his English friend, Robert Ingham:

"I have been cheered by the vote of the House of Commons on Mr. Richard's motion. . . . It cannot fail to exert a prodigious influence. I know no reform which promises such universal good as the release of any considerable portion of present war expenditures or expenditure on armaments, so that they can be applied to purposes of civilization. It is absurd to call this Utopian. . . . Here is an open and incessant waste. Why not stop it? Here is something which keeps human thoughts on bloodshed, and rears men to slay each other. Why not turn their thoughts to things which contribute to human happiness? Mr. Richard has done a great work, and so has the House of Commons. . . . Such a presentation of the case must have an effect on the continent as well as in England, teaching reason. I shall not live to see the great cause triumph. I often wish I had been born a few years later, and one reason is because I long to witness the harmony of nations, which I am sure is near. When an evil so great is recognized and discussed, the remedy must be at hand."

*
* *

But it was to Harvard University that Charles Sumner addressed his first striking message and his last, in behalf of the rule of peace. The first message was through Henry Ware. Mr. Ware, a graduate of Harvard of the class of 1843, writes:

"I went with Professor Felton one day, just after our Commencement parts had been assigned, into Sumner's office; and he, kindly asking what I had got, and being told that I had to *do* a Latin oration, asked me what subject I had chosen. I replied that I had not yet found a text to my mind. 'Then,' said he, 'I will give you one, — *De imperio pacis;* talk about *that.*' And," says Mr. Ware, "I did."

His last message was through his Will, the most memorable provision of which was as follows:

"I bequeath to the President and Fellows of Harvard College one thousand dollars in trust, for an annual prize for the best dissertation by any student of the College, or any of its schools, undergraduate or graduate, on Universal Peace and the methods by which war may be permanent-

ly superseded. I do this in the hope of drawing the attention of students to the practicability of organizing peace among nations, which I sincerely believe may be done. I cannot doubt that the same modes of decision which now prevail between individuals, between towns, and between smaller communities, may be extended to nations."

*
* *

We cannot doubt that more and more, as days go on, the attention of the students of Harvard University will be drawn to Sumner's last solemn call and charge; that this "most ancient, most interesting and most important seat of learning in the land," to which, in the sweep of his great oration, he could not allude without pausing to pay his tribute of filial affection, will more and more become a centre where educated and aspiring youth, with their hearts kindled by Sumner's gospel and with great visions of a better future, will provoke each other to high argument, and in times of war prepare for peace. Upon each student's desk shall lie, as a book of each student's Bible, the great oration of the greatest son of Harvard who in the memory of men now living has gone forth from Harvard's halls into the councils of the nation; and no page of it will be pondered more than that which sets forth how, if we would transfer to the offices of education and development the millions now appropriated so lavishly for destruction and defence, the need of destruction and defence would quickly cease.

With two causes the name of the great Harvard senator is identified — the cause of freedom and the cause of peace. From the wall of the memorial hall which Harvard built to commemorate the services of her sons in the cause of freedom, Sumner's face looks down upon the hundreds of students gathering daily in that most holy place, and upon the hundreds of alumni who, "in the memories of a youth nurtured in her classic retreats," come up to the ancient university as each Commencement week comes round. As that face looks down on them in the years to come, may it not speak chiefly to them of the past, of the victory of the cause of freedom whose fruits we enjoy to-day, but of the future, the triumph, which he so longed to live to see and which the educated youth of America can do so much to hasten, of the cause of universal peace. Ever and ever may Harvard consider wherein the true grandeur of nations lies, and ever and ever hear the first and last message of her great statesman, giving a new burden and new power to her great singer's gospel:

"Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error;
There were no need of arsenals or forts."

Boston Public Library
Central Library, Copley Square

Division of
Reference and Research Services

The Date Due Card in the pocket indicates the date on or before which this book should be returned to the Library.

Please do not remove cards from this pocket.